UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,484	12/22/2003	Michael J. Williams	037607-0177	7775
³⁴⁰⁹⁹ FANN-MKE C	7590 01/16/200 C/O	EXAMINER		
FOLEY & LAR	RDNER LLP CONSIN AVENUE	HAMMOND III, THOMAS M		
	, WI 53202-5306		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3695	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/743,484	WILLIAMS ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	THOMAS M. HAMMOND III	3695			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 Oct</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 is/are withdrawn fro 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-25 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	em consideration.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence are Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction and the confidence are the con	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) ☐ Notice of Informal P	ate			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:				

Art Unit: 3695

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

- 1. This action is in reply to the Applicant's response filed on 22 October 2008.
- 2. Claim 3 has been cancelled.
- 3. Claims 1, 8, 9 and 15 have been amended.
- 4. Claims 1, 2, and 4-25 are currently pending and have been examined.

Art Unit: 3695

Response to Arguments

5. 101 Rejections

6. With regard to claims 8-14, the Applicant has amended the claims to feature a "processing unit" and argues that such addition is sufficient to disclose the physical components of the system. While the Examiner appreciates the Applicant's attempt to overcome the current rejections, the Examiner asserts that such additional limitation does not disclose the necessary physical components of the system. Generally speaking, units, modules, code, and the like can encompass computer software unless explicitly defined in the specification. The Applicant has not provided such explicit disclosure of the processing unit so as to overcome the current rejections. Accordingly, claims 8-14

remain rejected.

7. Prior Art Rejections

8. The Applicant's arguments are considered moot, in view of the new grounds of rejection, necessitated by the Applicant's substantial amendments to the claimed invention and further review of the prior art submitted by the

Applicant.

Art Unit: 3695

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

9. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

10. Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory

subject matter.

11. With regard to claims 8-14, the Applicant recites a system for valuing a mortgage loan for sale, however, without limitations as to the physical components of the system. The Examiner asserts that the limitations of a "processing unit", "user interface" and a "pricing engine" are interpreted as computer software, per se. Under the current guidelines of 35 U.S.C. 101, computer code per se, it not eligible for patentability.

Art Unit: 3695

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States

13. Claim1, 2, and 4-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fannie Mae, "Secondary Marketing: Cash", 1997.

As per claim 1

Fannie Mae teaches:

- Retrieving information regarding the individual mortgage loan using the identifier, the information including the gross interest rate and a product type (see at least pages 39-50)
- Retrieving a required yield associated with the product type (see at least pages 39-50)
- Determining adjustments to the required yield based on at least one of (1) a credit risk associated with the borrower, (2) a loan-to-value ratio, and (3) loan purpose (see at least pages 39-50)
- Determining an interest rate portfolio yield based on at least the gross interest rate and the adjustments (see at least pages 39-50)
- Determining a yield difference based on at least the required yield and the interest rate portfolio yield (see at least pages 39-50)
- Retrieving a trade-off ratio (see at least pages 39-50)
- Determining a price difference based at least one the yield difference and the trade-off ratio (see at least pages 39-50)
- Determining a price for sale of the individual mortgage loan to a secondary mortgage market purchaser based at least on the price difference (see at least pages 39-50)

Art Unit: 3695

As per claims 2 and 4-7

Fannie Mae teaches the method of claim 1, as described above.

Fannie Mae further teaches:

- Wherein the required yield is retrieved from a current yield/trade-off schedule (see at least pages 39-50)

- Wherein determining the interest rate portfolio yield includes calculating a difference between the gross

interest rate and the adjustments (see at least pages 39-50)

- Wherein determining the yield difference includes calculating a difference between the required yield and

the interest rate portfolio yield (see at least pages 39-50)

- Wherein the trade-off ratio reflects what is paid in price for one basis-point in yield (see at least pages 39-

50)

- Wherein determining the price difference includes multiplying the yield difference and the trade-off ratio

(see at least pages 39-50)

As per claims 8-21

Claims 8-21 are interpreted to encompass substantially the same scope as claims 1-7. Accordingly, claims 8-21

are rejected in substantially the same manner as claims 1-7.

As per claim 22

Fannie Mae teaches the method of claim 1, as described above.

Fannie Mae further teaches:

- Wherein the individual mortgage loan is selected from a plurality of approved mortgage loan products

identified by an underwriting engine associated with the online mortgage loan system (see at least pages

39-50)

Art Unit: 3695

As per claim 23

Fannie Mae teaches the method of claim 22, as described above.

Fannie Mae further teaches:

Wherein the underwriting engine generates underwriting recommendations based at least in part on preselected underwriting guidelines of a secondary mortgage market purchaser (see at least pages 39-50)

As per claims 24-25

Claims 24-25 are interpreted to encompass substantially the same scope as claims 22-23. Accordingly, claims 24-25 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claims 22-23.

Art Unit: 3695

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in

37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the

mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final

action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period,

then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however,

will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be

directed to Thomas M. Hammond III whose telephone number is 571-270-1829. The examiner can normally be

reached on Monday - Friday, 7AM - 5PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Kyle

can be reached on 571-272-6746. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding

is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information

Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR

or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the

Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like

assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-

786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Thomas M Hammond III Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3695 US Patent & Trademark Office

14 January 2009

/Thu Thao Havan/

Art Unit: 3695

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3695